

EXHIBIT “17”

No. 05-2191

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT**

**In re:
The IT Group, Inc., et al.,
Debtors.**

**ACCARDI, et al.,
Appellants,
v.
IT LITIGATION TRUST, et al.,
Appellees.**

On Appeal From The United States District Court
For The District Of Delaware,
Civil Action No. 04-146, Judge Joseph J. Farnan

APPELLEES' CONSOLIDATED BRIEF

Michael J. Prame
Groom Law Group, Chartered
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-5893
Attorneys for Dr. Francis J. Harvey

John Cunningham
Ileana Cruz
White and Case, LLP
First Union Financial Center
200 South Biscayne Boulevard
Miami, FL 33131-2352
Attorneys for the IT Litigation Trust

Thomas Patten
David Becker
Latham & Watkins
555 Eleventh Street, N.W.
Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20004-1304
Attorneys for Carlyle Partners, II, L.P.

Mark A. Willard
Sandra R. Mihok
Delia Bouwers Bianchin
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott
600 Grant Street, Suite 4400
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Attorneys for Anthony J. DeLuca

Charles A. De Monaco
Richard J. Federowicz
Kimberly L. Haddox
Dickie McCamey & Chilcote, P.C.
Two PPG Place, Suite 400
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
Attorneys for Harry J. Soose

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	v
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS	5
A. THE IT DEFERRED COMPENSATION PLAN.....	5
B. PLAN ADMINISTRATION AND TAX TREATMENT.....	9
C. ALLEGED ORAL STATEMENT CONCERNING PLAN FUNDING.....	9
STANDARD OF REVIEW	10
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	11
ARGUMENT	14
I. THE UNAMBIGUOUS PLAN LANGUAGE ESTABLISHES THAT THE PLAN IS UNFUNDDED	14
A. STATUTORY OVERVIEW	15
B. DETERMINING WHETHER A PLAN IS UNFUNDDED.....	17
C. THE PLAN IS AN UNFUNDDED TOP HAT PLAN	20
II. DEFENDANTS DID NOT HAVE A DUTY TO FUND A TRUST FOR THE EXCLUSIVE BENEFIT OF THE PLAN PARTICIPANTS	21
A. THE PLAN IS UNFUNDDED EVEN THOUGH THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE WAS ALLOCATED DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY TO	

REQUIRE ASSETS TO BE SET ASIDE IN A RABBI TRUST.....	22
B. THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE COULD NOT AMEND THE TRUST OR CAUSE A PRE-PETITION DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS	28
1. THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE HAD NEITHER THE POWER NOR THE DUTY TO AMEND THE TRUST	28
2. THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE LACKED THE AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE DEBTORS TO PAY BENEFITS TO THE PARTICIPANTS PRIOR TO THE PETITION DATE	32
III. THE DISTRICT COURT AND BANKRUPTCY COURT DID NOT OTHERWISE ERR IN THEIR ANALYSIS	33
A. THE DISTRICT COURT AND BANKRUPTCY COURT PROPERLY ANALYZED THE ALLEGED ORAL REPRESENTATION	33
B. THE BANKRUPTCY COURT PROPERLY CONSIDERED THE TAX TREATMENT OF THE COMPENSATION DEFERRED BY THE PARTICIPANTS UNDER THE PLAN.....	35
CONCLUSION	37
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH FED. R. APP. P. 32(a)(7)(B)	39
CERTIFICATE OF BAR MEMBERSHIP	39
ADDENDA	40

STANDARD OF REVIEW

In its review, this Court stands in the shoes of the District Court, applying a clearly erroneous standard to the Bankruptcy Court's findings of fact and a *de novo* standard to its legal conclusions. *American Flint Glass Workers Union v. Anchor Resolution Corp.*, 197 F.3d 76, 80 (3d Cir. 1999). In this case, the decisions by both the District Court and the Bankruptcy Court were based on the legal conclusion that the Participants' Second Amended Complaint failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. (App. 64-85 (Bankr. Op., Feb. 3, 2004); App. 55-63 (Dist. Ct. Del. Mem. Op., Mar. 3, 2005).) This Court, therefore, reviews the matter *de novo*. See *American Flint Glass*, 197 F.3d at 80.

A complaint should be dismissed if, accepting all well-pleaded allegations in the complaint as true, and viewing them in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, the plaintiff is not entitled to relief. *Oatway v. American Int'l Group, Inc.*, 325 F.3d 184, 187 (3d Cir. 2003). In determining whether the Participants' Second Amended Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, "the [C]ourt may consider documents which are attached to or submitted with the complaint, as well as legal arguments presented in memorandum or briefs and arguments of counsel." *Pryor v. National Collegiate Athletic Ass'n*, 288 F.3d 548, 560 (3d Cir. 2002).